

Regularity of weak minimizers of the K-energy and applications to properness and K-stability

Robert J. Berman, Tamás Darvas, Chinh H. Lu

Abstract

Let (X, ω) be a compact Kähler manifold and $\mathcal{H}$ the space of Kähler metrics cohomologous to ω . If a cscK metric exists in $\mathcal{H}$, we show that all finite energy minimizers of the extended K-energy are smooth cscK metrics, partially confirming a conjecture of Y.A. Rubinstein and the second author. As an immediate application, we obtain that existence of a cscK metric in $\mathcal{H}$ implies J-properness of the K-energy, thus confirming one direction of a conjecture of Tian. Exploiting this properness result we prove that an ample line bundle (X, L) admitting a cscK metric in $c_1(L)$ is K -polystable.

1 Introduction and main results

Let (X, J, ω) be a compact connected Kähler manifold. By $\mathcal{H}_\omega = \{v \in C^\infty(X), \omega_v := \omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}v > 0\}$ we denote the space of Kähler potentials. According to the $\partial\bar{\partial}$ -lemma of Hodge theory, the level set

$$\mathcal{H} := \mathcal{H}_\omega \cap \text{AM}^{-1}(0)$$

is isomorphic to the space of Kähler metrics cohomologous to ω , and we always work on the level of potentials unless specified otherwise (for the definition of AM see (4) below). The connected Lie group

$$G := \text{Aut}_0(X, J)$$

has a natural action on $\mathcal{H}$ given by pullback of metrics (see [DR, Section 5.2] for a precise description on the level of potentials).

Motivated by results and ideas in conformal geometry, in the 90's Tian introduced the notion of “J-properness” on $\mathcal{H}$ [Ti1, Definition 5.1] in terms of Aubin’s nonlinear energy functional J_ω and the Mabuchi K-energy $\mathcal{K}$. This condition says that for any $u_j \in \mathcal{H}$ we have

$$J_\omega(u_j) \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{implies} \quad \mathcal{K}(u_j) \rightarrow \infty. \quad (1)$$

We refer to Section 2 for the precise definitions of J_ω and $\mathcal{K}$. Tian conjectured that existence of constant scalar curvature Kähler (cscK) metrics in $\mathcal{H}$ should be equivalent to J-properness of the K-energy $\mathcal{K}$ [Ti1, Remark 5.2], [Ti3] and this was proved for Fano manifolds with G trivial [Ti2, TZ]. In [PSSW] the “strong form” of the J-properness condition (1) was obtained, saying that the K-energy grows at least linearly with respect to the J-functional, and this stronger form has been later adopted in the literature, sometimes referred to as “coercivity”.

When G is non-trivial it was known that the conjecture cannot, in general, hold as stated above and numerous modifications were proposed by Tian (see [Ti3, Conjecture 7.12], [Ti4]). In [DR], Y.A. Rubinstein and the second named author disproved

one of these conjectures, proved the rest for general Fano manifolds, and the following conjecture was stated for general Kähler manifolds:

Conjecture 1.1. *Suppose (X, ω) is a Kähler manifold. There exists a cscK metric cohomologous to ω if and only if for some $C, D > 0$ we have*

$$\mathcal{K}(u) \geq C \inf_{g \in G} J_\omega(g.u) - D, \quad u \in \mathcal{H}.$$

This “modified properness conjecture” thus reduces to Tian’s original prediction in case G is trivial and was originally stated for Fano manifolds by Tian himself [Ti4]. It was proved in this context in [DR, Theorem 2.4], and this paper also linked the resolution of the general conjecture to a regularity question on weak minimizers of the K-energy that we elaborate now.

We denote by $(\mathcal{E}^1, d_1)$ the metric completion of $\mathcal{H}_\omega$ with respect to the L^1 -type Mabuchi path length metric d_1 , realized in the space $\mathcal{E}^1$ of finite energy potentials [Da2]. The point of connection with the questions investigated here is the fact that d_1 metric growth is comparable to J_ω [DR, Proposition 5.5], and we refer to [DR, Section 4, Section 5] for a more detailed exposition on how the d_1 -metric geometry relates to J-properness. For the corresponding picture for the L^2 -Mabuchi metric, originally conjectured by Guedj in a preliminary version of [G], we refer to [Da1]. Let us now state the regularity conjecture of [DR] and the theorem that connects it to Conjecture 1.1 above:

Conjecture 1.2 ([DR]). *Suppose (X, ω) is a compact Kähler manifold. The minimizers of the extended K-energy $\mathcal{K} : \mathcal{E}^1 \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ are smooth cscK metrics.*

Theorem 1.3 ([DR]). *Conjecture 1.2 implies Conjecture 1.1.*

Our first main result partially confirms Conjecture 1.2 and also a less general conjecture of X.X. Chen [Ch2, Conjecture 6.3]:

Theorem 1.4. *Suppose (X, ω) is a cscK manifold. If $u \in \mathcal{E}^1$ minimizes the extended K-energy $\mathcal{K} : \mathcal{E}^1 \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$, then u is a smooth cscK potential. In particular there exists $g \in G$ such that $g^*\omega_u = \omega$.*

The last claim follows from the uniqueness result of [BB]. Using this result and Theorem 1.3 we immediately obtain one direction of Conjecture 1.1:

Theorem 1.5. *Suppose (X, ω) is a cscK manifold. Then for some $C, D > 0$ we have*

$$\mathcal{K}(u) \geq C \inf_{g \in G} J_\omega(g.u) - D, \quad u \in \mathcal{H}. \tag{2}$$

The proof of Theorem 1.4 relies on the L^1 -Mabuchi geometry of $\mathcal{H}$ explored in [Da1, Da2], the finite energy pluripotential theory of [BBEGZ, GZ1] and the convexity methods of [DR, BDL] and [BB]. Realizing that the metric geometry of $\mathcal{H}$ and J-properness should be related seems to have first appeared in [Ch2, Conjecture 6.1], but this work rather proposed the use of the L^2 -Mabuchi metric on $\mathcal{H}$.

As a consequence of Theorem 1.5 and the techniques of [Ti2, Be3] we obtain a result on K-polystability, originally proved by Mabuchi [Ma2, Ma3], using a completely different argument. Slightly less general, or different flavor results were obtained by Stoppa, Stoppa-Székelyhidi, Székelyhidi [Sto, StSz, Sz1] and others. We recall the relevant terminology in the last section of the paper.

Theorem 1.6. *Suppose $L \rightarrow X$ is a positive line bundle. If there exists a cscK metric in the class $c_1(L)$, then (X, L) is K-polystable.*

The idea of proving K-stability via properness goes back to Tian’s seminal paper [Ti2]. The main point of our approach, involving geodesic rays, is to generalize the findings of [Be3] from the Fano case.

In case the group G is trivial, the results in [BBJ, BHJ2, DeR] show that properness implies uniform K-stability in the L^1 -sense (for terminology, see [BBJ, BHJ2, DeR] and references therein). Thus, as a consequence of Theorem 1.5 we obtain the following:

Theorem 1.7. *Assume that (X, L) is a positive line bundle and G is trivial. If there exists a cscK metric in $c_1(L)$, then (X, L) is uniformly K-stable.*

Further relations to previous results. We end the introduction with a brief (but by no means complete) discussion about further relations to previous results. Much work has been done on Tian’s properness conjectures in the case when the Kähler class is anti-canonical and we refer to [DR] for a detailed historical account. To our knowledge, in the case of cscK metrics, excluding perhaps the particular case of toric Kähler manifolds, no partial results are known, even when G is trivial.

Conjecture 1.2 is known to be true in case (X, ω) is Fano [Be2]. Proving the reverse direction of Conjecture 1.1 via Theorem 1.3 seems to require further progress on the weak non-linear theory of fourth order partial differential equations and seems to be out of reach for the moment.

Using the ideas of [BB, DR], it is likely that different versions of the above properness theorem can be obtained assuming existence of extremal or soliton/edge type cscK metrics, but also for different spaces of potentials, mimicking [DR, Theorem 2.1, Theorem 2.11, Theorem 2.12]. We refer to [BDL, Remark 4.14] for a result on twisted cscK metrics.

Our K-stability results fit into a circle of ideas surrounding the Yau–Tian–Donaldson conjecture on a polarized manifold (X, L) , saying that the first Chern class of L contains a Kähler metric with constant scalar curvature if and only if (X, L) is stable in an appropriate sense, inspired by Geometric Invariant Theory. In the formulation introduced by Donaldson [Do] the stability in question was formulated as K-polystability, but in view of an example in [ACGT] there is widespread belief that the notion of K-(poly)stability has to be strengthened (unless X is Fano and L is the anti-canonical polarization). In case G is trivial, uniform K-stability was introduced in the thesis of Székelyhidi (see also [Sz1, Der, BHJ1]) to provide such a stronger notion. In the light of the recent variational approach to the Yau–Tian–Donaldson conjecture introduced in [BBJ] it seems that the main analytical hurdle in proving that uniform K-stability conversely implies the existence of a constant scalar curvature metric is the general form of the regularity conjecture alluded to above. Finally, it seems likely that our proof of K-polystability can be extended to the transcendental setting considered very recently in [SD, DeR] but we will not go further into this here. In the case when G is trivial, properness does imply uniform K-stability also in the transcendental setting, as shown in [DeR].

Acknowledgments. The first named author was supported by the Swedish Research Council, the European Research Council and the Knut and Alice Wallenberg foundation. The second named author has been partially supported by BSF grant 2012236.

The first named author is grateful to Sébastien Boucksom and Mattias Jonsson for discussions and for sharing the preprint [BHJ2]. The second named author would like to thank L. Lempert, Y. Rubinstein for enlightening discussions on the topic of the paper and for making suggestions on how to improve the paper. The second named author would also like to thank G. Tian for explaining him how the techniques of [Ti2] can be used to give another proof of Theorem 1.6.

At the same time the first version of this paper appeared on the arXiv, the work of Codogni–Stoppa [CS] also came out, and gave an independent proof of Theorem 1.6 using techniques from algebraic geometry.

2 The finite energy continuity method

Let us first recall some terminology. Given a positive closed $(1,1)$ -form χ , the functional $J_\chi : \mathcal{E}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as follows:

$$J_\chi(u) = \text{AM}_\chi(u) - \frac{1}{V} \left(\int_X \chi \wedge \omega^{n-1} \right) \text{AM}(u), \quad (3)$$

where $V = \int_X \omega^n$, AM and AM_χ is the Aubin-Mabuchi energy and its “ χ -contracted” version:

$$\text{AM}(u) = \frac{1}{(n+1)V} \sum_{j=0}^n \int_X u \omega_u^j \wedge \omega^{n-j}, \quad \text{AM}_\chi(u) = \frac{1}{nV} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \int_X u \chi \wedge \omega_u^j \wedge \omega^{n-1-j}. \quad (4)$$

Recall the definition of the $\mathcal{I}$ functional from [BBEGZ]:

$$\mathcal{I}(u_0, u_1) = \int_X (u_0 - u_1)(\omega_{u_1}^n - \omega_{u_0}^n), \quad u_0, u_1 \in \mathcal{E}_\omega^1.$$

This functional is non-negative, symmetric and invariant under adding constants. An elementary calculation gives the following useful estimates:

$$\frac{1}{n(n+1)} \mathcal{I}(u_0, u_1) \leq J_{\omega_{u_0}}(u_1) - J_{\omega_{u_0}}(u_0) \leq \mathcal{I}(u_0, u_1), \quad u_0, u_1 \in \mathcal{E}^1 \cap \text{AM}^{-1}(0). \quad (5)$$

The (extended) K-energy and its χ -twisted version $\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}_\chi : \mathcal{E}^1 \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ are defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{K}(u) := \text{Ent}(\omega^n, \omega_u^n) + \bar{S} \text{AM}(u) - n \text{AM}_{\text{Ric}\omega}(u), \quad \mathcal{K}_\chi(u) = \mathcal{K}(u) + n J_\chi(u), \quad (6)$$

where $\text{Ent}(\omega^n, \omega_u^n) = V^{-1} \int_X \log(\omega_u^n / \omega^n) \omega_u^n$ is the entropy of the measure ω_u^n with respect to ω^n . When restricted to $\mathcal{H}_\omega$, the above formula for the K-energy was originally introduced by Chen–Tian [Ch1]. In [DR, Proposition 5.26] it is shown that this functional naturally extends to the L^1 -Mabuchi completion of $\mathcal{H}_\omega$, which is just $\mathcal{E}^1$, and the extension is d_1 -lsc (in [BDL, Theorem 1.2] it was shown that the same holds for the L^p completions as well). For more information on the metric spaces $(\mathcal{H}_\omega, d_p)$ we refer to [Da1, Da2], where these metric structures were introduced. In this note we will only focus on the case $p = 1$.

Let us introduce the $\mathcal{E}^1$ -minimizer set of $\mathcal{K}$:

$$\mathcal{M}^1 = \{u \in \mathcal{E}^1 \cap \text{AM}^{-1}(0) \mid \mathcal{K}(u) = \inf_{v \in \mathcal{E}^1} \mathcal{K}(v)\}.$$

Given that $\mathcal{K} : \mathcal{E}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ is convex [BDL, Theorem 1.2], it is standard to check that the minimizer set $\mathcal{M}^1$ is geodesically complete with respect to the finite energy geodesics of $\mathcal{E}^1$. When $\chi > 0$, using this last fact and [BDL, Theorem 4.12], if there exists $v_\chi \in \mathcal{M}^1$ such that $J_\chi(v_\chi) = \inf_{v \in \mathcal{M}^1} J_\chi(v)$, it has to be unique. This fact will be used below.

In fact, whenever $\mathcal{M}^1$ is non-empty, as a consequence of [BBEGZ, Theorem 2.17], the restriction $J_\chi|_{\mathcal{M}^1}$ always admits a minimizer, but we will not need this here.

The following two propositions represent the main analytic ingredient of this note and revolve around the finite energy continuity method for cscK metrics, whose smooth version was recently explored in [CPZ].

Proposition 2.1. *Assume that $\mathcal{M}^1$ is nonempty and $u \in \mathcal{H}_\omega$. Then for any $\lambda > 0$, there exists a unique minimizer $v^\lambda \in \mathcal{E}^1 \cap \text{AM}^{-1}(0)$ of $\mathcal{K}_{\lambda\omega_u}$. The curve $[0, \infty) \ni \lambda \rightarrow v^\lambda \in \mathcal{E}^1 \cap \text{AM}^{-1}(0)$ is d_1 -continuous, d_1 -bounded with $v^0 = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} v^\lambda$ being the unique minimizer of J_{ω_u} on $\mathcal{M}^1$. Additionally, for any $w \in \mathcal{M}^1$, $\lambda \geq 0$ we have*

$$\mathcal{I}(v^\lambda, u) \leq n(n+1)\mathcal{I}(w, u). \quad (7)$$

Proof. First we show that the curve $\lambda \rightarrow v^\lambda$ described in the statement exists. Fixing $\lambda > 0$, observe that $\mathcal{K}_{\lambda\omega_u} = \mathcal{K} + \frac{\lambda}{n}J_{\omega_u}$. Let $u_j \in \mathcal{E}^1 \cap \text{AM}^{-1}(0)$ be a minimizing sequence of $\mathcal{K}_{\lambda\omega_u}$. As $\mathcal{M}^1$ is nonempty, it follows that $\mathcal{K}$ is bounded from below, but so is J_{ω_u} , given the bound $J_{\omega_u}(v) - J_{\omega_u}(u) \geq 0$, $v \in \mathcal{E}^1$, which follows from (5). These lower bounds together give that both $J_{\omega_u}(u_j)$ and $\mathcal{K}(u_j)$ are in fact uniformly bounded, $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

As $[\omega_u]_{dR} = [\omega]_{dR}$, [DR, Proposition 5.5] gives that $d_1(0, u_j)$ is also uniformly bounded. Using this and the uniform bound on $\mathcal{K}(u_j)$, we get that $\text{Ent}(\omega^n, \omega_{u_j}^n) \geq 0$ is also uniformly bounded above, hence we can apply [BBEGZ, Theorem 2.17] (see [DR, Theorem 5.6] for an equivalent formulation that fits our context most). By this last compactness result, from u_j we can extract a d_1 -convergent subsequence, converging to $v^\lambda \in \mathcal{E}^1$. By the d_1 -lower semi-continuity of $\mathcal{K}_{\lambda\omega_u}$ [BDL, Theorem 1.2] we get that v^λ is a $\mathcal{E}^1$ -minimizer of $\mathcal{K}_{\lambda\omega_u}$ and by [BDL, Theorem 4.13] this minimizer has to be unique.

Now we argue (7). Let $w \in \mathcal{M}^1$ and $\lambda > 0$. As v^λ and w minimize $\mathcal{K}_{\lambda\omega_u}$ and $\mathcal{K}$ respectively, we can write the following:

$$\mathcal{K}(w) + \frac{\lambda}{n}J_{\omega_u}(v^\lambda) \leq \mathcal{K}(v^\lambda) + \frac{\lambda}{n}J_{\omega_u}(v^\lambda) = \mathcal{K}_{\lambda\omega_u}(v^\lambda) \leq \mathcal{K}_{\lambda\omega_u}(w) = \mathcal{K}(w) + \frac{\lambda}{n}J_{\omega_u}(w),$$

hence $J_{\omega_u}(v^\lambda) \leq J_{\omega_u}(w)$. Subtracting $J_{\omega_u}(u)$ from this and using (5) we get (7) for $\lambda > 0$.

We argue that $\{v^\lambda\}_{\lambda>0}$ is d_1 -bounded and relatively d_1 -compact. Given that $J_{\omega_u}(u) \leq J_{\omega_u}(v^\lambda) \leq J_{\omega_u}(w)$, [DR, Proposition 5.5] implies that $d_1(0, v^\lambda)$ is uniformly bounded, $\lambda > 0$. Observe that we have a trivial upper bound $\mathcal{K}_{\lambda\omega_u}(v^\lambda) \leq \mathcal{K}_{\lambda\omega_u}(0) = \mathcal{K}(0)$. Since all terms except the first in the expression of $\mathcal{K}_{\lambda\omega_u}(v^\lambda)$ from (6) are bounded by $d_1(0, v^\lambda)$ it follows that $\text{Ent}(\omega^n, \omega_{v^\lambda}^n) \geq 0$ is also uniformly bounded from above, ultimately giving that $\{v^\lambda\}_{\lambda>0}$ is relatively d_1 -compact, again by [BBEGZ, Theorem 2.17].

We claim now that $\lambda \rightarrow v^\lambda$ is d_1 -continuous for $\lambda > 0$. Indeed, assume that $\{\lambda_j\}_j$ converges to $\lambda > 0$. As shown above, the sequence v^{λ_j} is relatively d_1 -compact, hence it suffices to prove that any limit of this sequence coincides with v^λ . So, we can assume that $v^{\lambda_j} \rightarrow v$ and we will show that $v = v^\lambda$. For any $h \in \mathcal{E}^1$ we have

$$\mathcal{K}_{\lambda_j\omega_u}(h) \geq \mathcal{K}_{\lambda_j\omega_u}(v^{\lambda_j}) = \mathcal{K}(v^{\lambda_j}) + \frac{\lambda_j}{n}J_{\omega_u}(v^{\lambda_j}).$$

Letting $j \rightarrow +\infty$, we can use that $\mathcal{K}$ is d_1 -lsc and J_{ω_u} is d_1 -continuous, to obtain that $\mathcal{K}_{\lambda\omega_u}(h) \geq \mathcal{K}_{\lambda\omega_u}(v)$. Uniqueness of minimizers of $\mathcal{K}_{\lambda\omega_u}$ [BDL, Theorem 4.13] now gives that $v^\lambda = v$, what we wanted to prove.

Finally, we focus on continuity at $\lambda = 0$. Using relative compactness of $\{v^\lambda\}_{\lambda>0}$, we can find $\lambda_j \rightarrow 0$ and $v^0 \in \mathcal{E}^1$ such that $d_1(v^{\lambda_j}, v^0) \rightarrow 0$. We will show that v^0 is independent of the choice of λ_j . By the joint lower semi-continuity of $(h, \lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{\lambda\omega_u}(h)$ it follows that $v^0 \in \mathcal{M}^1$. Let $q \in \mathcal{M}^1$ be arbitrary. Then we have that

$$\mathcal{K}(q) \leq \mathcal{K}(v^{\lambda_j}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{K}_{\lambda\omega_u}(v^{\lambda_j}) \leq \mathcal{K}_{\lambda\omega_u}(q),$$

implying that $\frac{\lambda}{n}J_{\omega_u}(v^{\lambda_j}) \leq \frac{\lambda}{n}J_{\omega_u}(q)$, hence $J_{\omega_u}(v^{\lambda_j}) \leq J_{\omega_u}(q)$. After taking $\lambda_j \rightarrow \infty$, it follows that $J_{\omega_u}(v^0) \leq J_{\omega_u}(q)$, hence v^0 is the unique minimizer of J_{ω_u} on $\mathcal{M}^1$ (see the comments preceding this proposition), finishing the proof. $\square$

As detailed in the next proposition, whose proof builds on the arguments of [BB], if a smooth cscK metric exists, then the minimizer of J_{ω_u} on $\mathcal{M}^1$ can be given more specifically:

Proposition 2.2. *Assume that $v \in \mathcal{H}_\omega \cap \text{AM}^{-1}(0)$ is a cscK potential and $u \in \mathcal{H}_\omega$. Then for some $g \in G$ we have:*

$$\inf_{w \in \mathcal{M}^1} J_{\omega_u}(w) = J_{\omega_u}(g.v).$$

Proof. By changing the reference metric from ω to ω_u , we can assume that $u = 0$. As a cscK metric exists, the group G is reductive, hence there exists $g \in G$ such that $J_\omega(g.v) = \min\{J_\omega(f.v) : f \in G\}$. This is indeed well known and can be seen from the fact that J_ω is equivalent with the growth of the d_1 -metric [DR, Proposition 5.5], and the Lie algebra of G has a very specific decomposition (for details see for example Section 6 of [DR], especially [DR, Proposition 6.2, Proposition 6.9]).

We denote $\tilde{v}^0 = g.v \in \mathcal{H}_\omega \cap \text{AM}^{-1}(0)$ and let $v^0 \in \mathcal{M}^1$ be the unique minimizer of J_ω on $\mathcal{M}^1$, known to exist by the previous proposition. We are done if we can show that $v^0 = \tilde{v}^0$. For each $\lambda \in (0, 1/2]$ let v^λ be the unique $\mathcal{E}^1$ -minimizer of $\mathcal{K}_{\lambda\omega}$. Then by Proposition 2.1 above, $d_1(v^\lambda, v^0) \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. Let F_λ and G denote the differential of $\mathcal{K}_{\lambda\omega}|_{\mathcal{H}_\omega}$ and $nJ_\omega|_{\mathcal{H}_\omega}$ respectively.

Given the specific choice of $\tilde{v}_0$, by the same argument as in the proof of [BB, Theorem 4.4, Theorem 4.7] we can find $h \in C^\infty(X)$ such that

$$D_h F_0|_{\tilde{v}^0} = -G(\tilde{v}^0).$$

Again going back to the arguments in [BB, Theorem 4.4, Theorem 4.7], for small enough $\lambda \geq 0$ this identity implies

$$|F_\lambda(\tilde{v}^0 + \lambda h).w| \leq C\lambda^2 \sup |w|, \quad \forall w \in C(X).$$

Given this last estimate and the explicit formula for F_λ going back to Mabuchi [Ma1] we can further write:

$$F_\lambda(\tilde{v}^0 + \lambda h).w = \int_X w f_\lambda \omega_{\tilde{v}^0 + \lambda h}^n, \quad (8)$$

where $f_\lambda = \overline{S}_\omega - S_{\omega_{\tilde{v}^0 + \lambda h}} + \lambda \text{Tr}^{\omega_{\tilde{v}^0 + \lambda h}} \omega \in C^\infty(X)$ satisfies $f_\lambda = O(\lambda^2)$.

Let $[0, 1] \ni t \rightarrow u_t^\lambda \in \mathcal{E}^1$ be the finite energy geodesic connecting $u_0^\lambda := v^\lambda \in \mathcal{E}^1$ with $u_1^\lambda := \tilde{v}^0 + \lambda h \in \mathcal{H}_\omega$. By Lemma 2.3 below we can write:

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=1^-} \mathcal{K}_{\lambda\omega}(u_t^\lambda) \leq \int_X \dot{u}_1^\lambda f_\lambda \omega_{\tilde{v}^0 + \lambda h}^n.$$

Proposition 2.1 and the fact that $u_1^\lambda = \tilde{v}^0 + \lambda h$ is smooth gives that the quantities $d_1(0, u_1^\lambda)$ and $d_1(0, u_0^\lambda)$ are uniformly bounded. Consequently, by Lemma 2.4(ii) below we obtain the following estimate:

$$\int_X |\dot{u}_1^\lambda| \omega_{u_1^\lambda}^n = d_1(u_1^\lambda, u_0^\lambda) \leq d_1(0, u_0^\lambda) + d_1(0, u_1^\lambda) \leq C.$$

Since $f_\lambda = O(\lambda^2)$ we can ultimately write

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=1^-} \mathcal{K}_{\lambda\omega}(u_t^\lambda) \leq O(\lambda^2).$$

Recall that $u_0^\lambda = v^\lambda$ is the unique $\mathcal{E}^1$ -minimizer of the convex functional $\mathcal{K}_{\lambda\omega}$, thus $\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=1^-} \mathcal{K}_{\lambda\omega}(u_t^\lambda) \geq \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0^+} \mathcal{K}_{\lambda\omega}(u_t^\lambda) \geq 0$. Consequently, as both $t \rightarrow J_\omega(u_t^\lambda) = \text{AM}_\omega(u_t^\lambda)$ and $t \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(u_t^\lambda)$ are convex, we obtain the following sequence of estimates

$$0 \leq n\lambda \left(\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=1^-} - \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0^+} \right) \text{AM}_\omega(u_t^\lambda) \leq \left(\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=1^-} - \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0^+} \right) \mathcal{K}_{\lambda\omega}(u_t^\lambda) \leq O(\lambda^2).$$

Using convexity of $t \rightarrow \text{AM}_\omega(u_t^\lambda)$ again, this last estimate gives

$$0 \leq t \text{AM}_\omega(u_1^\lambda) + (1-t) \text{AM}_\omega(u_0^\lambda) - \text{AM}_\omega(u_t^\lambda) \leq t(1-t)O(\lambda), \quad t \in (0, 1).$$

Letting $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, using the endpoint stability of finite energy geodesic segments [BDL, Proposition 4.3] and the d_1 -continuity of AM_ω [DR, Lemma 5.23], we obtain that $t \rightarrow \text{AM}_\omega(u_t)$ is linear along the finite energy geodesic $[0, 1] \ni t \rightarrow u_t \in \mathcal{E}^1$ connecting v^0 to $\tilde{v}^0$. By [BDL, Theorem 4.12] this implies that $v^0 = \tilde{v}^0$, what we desired to prove. $\square$

As promised in the above argument, we provide the following lemma, which generalizes [BB, Lemma 3.5] to finite energy geodesics with one smooth endpoint:

Lemma 2.3. *Given $u_1 \in \mathcal{E}^1$ and $u_0 \in \mathcal{H}_\omega$ let $[0, 1] \ni t \rightarrow u_t \in \mathcal{E}^1$ be the finite energy geodesic connecting u_0, u_1 and χ is a smooth closed and positive $(1, 1)$ -form. Then*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\mathcal{K}_\chi(u_t) - \mathcal{K}_\chi(u_0)}{t} \geq \int_X (\bar{S}_\chi - S_{\omega_{u_0}} + \text{Tr}^{\omega_{u_0}} \chi) \dot{u}_0 \omega_{u_0}^n,$$

where $\bar{S}_\chi = nV^{-1} \int_X (\text{Ric } \omega - \chi) \wedge \omega^{n-1}$.

Proof. Using Theorem [BDL, Theorem 1.2] it is enough to show that

$$\frac{\mathcal{K}_\chi(u_t) - \mathcal{K}_\chi(u_0)}{t} \geq \int_X (\bar{S}_\chi - S_{\omega_{u_0}} + \text{Tr}^{\omega_{u_0}} \chi) \dot{u}_0 \omega_{u_0}^n, \quad t \in [0, 1]. \quad (9)$$

By [BDL, Theorem 1.2] there exists $u_t^k \in \mathcal{H}_\omega$ such that $d_1(u_t^k, u_t) \rightarrow 0$ and $\mathcal{K}_\chi(u_t^k) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_\chi(u_t)$. Let $[0, t] \ni l \rightarrow v_l^k \in \mathcal{E}^1$ be the weak $C^{1,1}$ geodesic connecting $u_0^k := u_0$ with u_t^k . By [BB, Lemma 3.5] we can write:

$$\frac{\mathcal{K}_\chi(u_t^k) - \mathcal{K}_\chi(u_0)}{t} \geq \int_X (\bar{S}_\chi - S_{\omega_{u_0}} + \text{Tr}^{\omega_{u_0}} \chi) \dot{v}_0^k \omega_{u_0}^n.$$

By the next lemma, after perhaps passing to a subsequence, we can apply the dominated convergence theorem on the right hand side and obtain (9). $\square$

Lemma 2.4. Suppose $u_1^j, u_1 \in \mathcal{E}^1$ satisfies $d_1(u_1^j, u_1) \rightarrow 0$ and $u_0 \in \mathcal{H}_\omega$. Let $[0, 1] \ni t \rightarrow u_t, u_t^j \in \mathcal{E}^1$ be the finite energy geodesics connecting u_0, u_1^j and u_0, u_1 respectively. The following hold:

- (i) There exists $f \in L^1(\omega_{u_0}^n)$, $j_k \rightarrow \infty$ such that $|\dot{u}_0^{j_k}| \leq f$ and $\dot{u}_0^{j_k} \rightarrow \dot{u}_0$ a.e.
- (ii) $d_1(u_0, u_1) = \int_X |\dot{u}_0| \omega_{u_0}^n$.

Proof. If $[0, 1] \ni t \rightarrow v_t \in \mathcal{E}^1$ is an arbitrary finite energy geodesic, we observe that $t \rightarrow v_t + t\alpha + (1-t)\beta$ is the finite energy geodesic connecting $v_0 + \beta$ and $v_1 + \alpha$, $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$. Using this observation, to establish (i) we can assume without loss of generality that

$$u_0 - 1 \geq u_1, u_1^j \quad (10)$$

We first show that (ii) holds in this particular case:

$$d_1(u_0, u_1) = \int_X -\dot{u}_0 \omega_{u_0}^n. \quad (11)$$

Indeed, let $\tilde{u}_1^j \in \mathcal{H}_\omega$ be a sequence decreasing to u_1 with $\tilde{u}_1^j \leq u_0$. By [Da2, Theorem 1], since $t \rightarrow \tilde{u}_t^j$ is monotone decreasing we have $d_1(u_0, \tilde{u}_1^j) = \int_X -\dot{\tilde{u}}_0^j \omega_{u_0}^n$, where $t \rightarrow \tilde{u}_t^j$ is the weak $C^{1,1}$ geodesic connecting $u_0, \tilde{u}_1^j$, which is decreasing in t . As $\tilde{u}_0 = u_0$ and $u_t^j \searrow u_t$, (11) follows from the monotone convergence theorem.

By [BDL, Proposition 2.6] there exists $j_k \rightarrow \infty$, $v_1^{j_k} \in \mathcal{E}^1$ increasing and $w_1^{j_k} \in \mathcal{E}^1$ decreasing such that $v_1^{j_k} \leq u_1^{j_k} \leq w_1^{j_k} \leq u_0$ and $d_1(u_1, v_1^{j_k}), d_1(u_1, w_1^{j_k}) \rightarrow 0$. Let $[0, 1] \ni t \rightarrow v_t^{j_k}, w_t^{j_k} \in \mathcal{E}^1$ be the finite energy geodesics connecting $u_0, v_1^{j_k}$ and $u_0, w_1^{j_k}$ respectively. By the comparison principle for finite energy geodesic segments we ultimately get $\dot{v}_0^{j_k} \leq \dot{w}_0^{j_k} \leq \dot{u}_0^{j_k} \leq \dot{u}_0 \leq 0$. We claim that for the monotone limits $\dot{v}_0 := \lim_k \dot{v}_0^{j_k}$ and $\dot{w}_0 := \lim_k \dot{w}_0^{j_k}$ we have $\dot{v}_0 = \dot{w}_0 = \dot{u}_0$ a.e., with this showing that $\dot{u}_0^{j_k} \rightarrow \dot{u}_0$ a.e. as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Indeed, by (11) we have $d_1(u_0, w_1^{j_k}) = \int_X -\dot{w}_0^{j_k} \omega_{u_0}^n$ and $d_1(u_0, v_1^{j_k}) = \int_X -\dot{v}_0^{j_k} \omega_{u_0}^n$. Applying the monotone/dominated convergence theorems, we can write $d_1(u_0, u_1) = \int_X -\dot{v}_0 \omega_{u_0}^n = \int_X -\dot{w}_0 \omega_{u_0}^n$. Since $\dot{v}_0 \leq \dot{u}_0 \leq \dot{w}_0$, it follows that $\dot{v}_0 = \dot{w}_0 = \dot{u}_0$ a.e. with respect to $\omega_{u_0}^n$, as we claimed.

Finally, as $\dot{v}_0^{j_1} \leq \dot{u}_0^{j_k} \leq 0$, using (11) we conclude that the function $f = |\dot{v}_0^{j_1}|$ satisfies the requirements of (i).

To argue (ii), let $\tilde{u}_1^j \in \mathcal{H}_\omega$ be the same decreasing approximating sequence from the beginning of the proof. As (10) may not hold, by [Da2, Theorem 1] we only have $d_1(u_0, \tilde{u}_1^j) = \int_X |\dot{\tilde{u}}_0^j| \omega_{u_0}^n$. By (i), after perhaps passing to a subsequence, we can use the dominated convergence theorem to finish the proof. $\square$

Remark 2.5. In the proof of Lemma 2.3 above, by using the Ricci flow techniques of [GZ2, DL], it is even possible to approximate u_t by a decreasing sequence of smooth potentials with convergent K -energy.

Remark 2.6. Propositions 2.1, 2.2 together imply that whenever a cscK potential $v \in \mathcal{H}_\omega \cap \text{AM}^{-1}(0)$ exists, then every “finite energy continuity path” $[0, \infty) \ni \lambda \rightarrow v^\lambda \in \mathcal{E}^1 \cap \text{AM}^{-1}(0)$ d_1 -converges to $g.v$ for some $g \in G$, with the crucial uniform estimate (7). Though we will not need it in this work, it is worth noting that (using the implicit function theorem and additional estimates) in [CPZ, Theorem 1.1] it is shown that $v^\lambda \in \mathcal{H}_\omega$ for small enough λ , and in fact $v^\lambda \rightarrow_{C^\infty} g.v$.

In the proof of Theorem 1.4 we will need one last auxiliary result:

Lemma 2.7. *Suppose $\mathcal{H}_\omega \cap \text{AM}^{-1}(0)$ contains a cscK potential. If $u \in \mathcal{H}_\omega \cap \text{AM}^{-1}(0)$ and $g_j \in G$ are such that $d_1(g_j.u, h) \rightarrow 0$ for some $h \in \mathcal{E}^1$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, then there exists $g \in G$ such that $g.u = h$.*

Proof. Let $v \in \mathcal{H}_\omega \cap \text{AM}^{-1}(0)$ be a cscK potential. By [DR, Propositions 6.2 and 6.9] there exists $k_j \in \text{Isom}_0(X, \omega_v)$ and a Hamiltonian vector field $X_j \in \text{isom}(X, \omega_v)$ such that $g_j = k_j \exp_I JX_j$. It is clear from the definition of the action of G on the level of potentials that $k_j.v = v$. Thus we can write

$$\begin{aligned} d_1(v, g_j.u) &= d_1(v, k_j \exp_I(JX_j).u) = d_1(k_j^{-1}v, \exp_I(JX_j).u) = d_1(v, \exp_I(JX_j).u) \\ &= d_1(\exp_I(-JX_j)v, u) \geq d_1(\exp_I(-JX_j)v, v) - d_1(v, u), \end{aligned}$$

giving that $d_1(\exp_I(-JX_j)v, v)$ is bounded independently of j . As $G = \text{Aut}_0(X, J)$ is reductive, the curve $[0, \infty) \ni t \rightarrow \exp_I(-tJX_j).v \in \mathcal{H}_\omega \cap \text{AM}^{-1}(0)$ is a d_1 -geodesic ray (see [DR, Section 7.1]), hence $\|X_j\|$ has to be uniformly bounded in $\text{isom}(X, \omega_v)$. By compactness, after possibly relabeling the sequences, we can choose $X_\infty \in \text{isom}(X, \omega_v)$ and $k \in \text{Isom}_0(X, \omega_v)$ such that $k_j \rightarrow k$ and $X_j \rightarrow X_\infty$ smoothly, hence also $g_j = k_j \exp_I(JX_j) \rightarrow g := k \exp_I(JX_\infty)$ smoothly. In particular this implies $d_1(g_j.u, g.u) \rightarrow 0$, hence $g.u = h$ by the non-degeneracy of d_1 . $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Let $v \in \mathcal{M}^1$. We have to show that $v = g.u$ for some $g \in G$. By [Da2] there exists $v^j \in \mathcal{H}_\omega \cap \text{AM}^{-1}(0)$ with $d_1(v_j, v) \rightarrow 0$.

For the moment fix $\lambda > 0$. As u realizes the minimum of $\mathcal{K}$, by Proposition 2.1 the functional $\mathcal{K}_{\lambda\omega_{v_j}}$ admits a unique minimum $v_j^\lambda \in \mathcal{E}^1 \cap \text{AM}^{-1}(0)$ satisfying $\mathcal{I}(v_j^\lambda, v_j) \leq n(n+1)\mathcal{I}(v_j, v)$. As $\mathcal{I}$ satisfies the quasi-triangle inequality (see [BBEGZ, Theorem 1.8]), it follows that for some $C := C(X, \omega) > 0$ we have in fact

$$\mathcal{I}(v_j^\lambda, v) \leq C\mathcal{I}(v_j, v). \quad (12)$$

Now we use that $u \in \mathcal{H}_\omega \cap \text{AM}^{-1}(0)$ is a cscK potential. Fixing j , Proposition 2.2 gives that the potentials v_j^λ d_1 -converge to $v^0 = g_j.u$ for some $g_j \in G$. Hence, letting $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ in (12) we can conclude

$$\mathcal{I}(g_j.u, v) \leq C\mathcal{I}(v_j, v).$$

Letting $j \rightarrow \infty$ in the above estimate we obtain $\mathcal{I}(g_j.u, v) \rightarrow 0$, which by [BBEGZ, Proposition 2.3] is equivalent to $\|g_j.u - v\|_{L^1(X)} \rightarrow 0$ and $\text{AM}(g_j.u) \rightarrow \text{AM}(v)$. By [Da2, Proposition 5.9] this is further equivalent to $d_1(g_j.u, v) \rightarrow 0$. Finally, by Lemma 2.7 there exists $g \in G$ such that $g.u = v$, finishing the proof. $\square$

3 K-polystability as a consequence of properness

As mentioned in the introduction, in our proof of Theorem 1.6 we use a geometric reasoning involving geodesic rays. But G. Tian has informed us that the original ideas from [Ti2] can also be generalized to the case when G is non-trivial and the central fiber of a test configuration is non-normal (by establishing a variant of the crucial “ C^0 -estimate” (20) via a Moser iteration argument).

Let us first fix some terminology. Let $L \rightarrow X$ be an ample line bundle over a Kähler manifold (X, ω) such that $c_1(L) = [\omega]$. A test configuration $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{X}, \pi, \rho)$ for (X, L) consists of a scheme $\mathcal{X}$ with a $\mathbb{C}^*$ -equivariant flat surjective morphism $\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$

and a relatively ample line bundle $\mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ with a $\mathbb{C}^*$ -action $\tau \rightarrow \rho_\tau$ on $\mathcal{L}$ such that $(X_1, \mathcal{L}|_{X_1}) = (X, kL)$ for some $k > 1$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $k = 1$, by treating $\mathcal{L}$ as a $\mathbb{Q}$ -line bundle. Following the findings of [LX], we will always assume that $\mathcal{X}$ is normal, which automatically makes the projection π flat.

Given any test configuration $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{X}, \pi, \rho)$, after raising $\mathcal{L}$ to a sufficiently high power, it is possible to find an equivariant embedding into $(\mathbb{CP}^N, \mathbb{C})$, such that $\mathcal{L}$ becomes the pullback of the relative $\mathcal{O}(1)$ -hyperplane bundle (see [Do, Th, PS1]).

This automatically allows to fix a semi-positive smooth “background” metric h on $\mathcal{L}$, that is positive on every X_τ slice and is S^1 -invariant. For the restrictions we introduce the notation $h_\tau = h|_{X_\tau}$, $\tau \in \mathbb{C}$.

Any other positive metric $\tilde{h}$ on $\mathcal{L}$ can be uniquely represented by a potential $u^{\tilde{h}, \mathcal{X}} \in \text{PSH}(\mathcal{X}, \Theta(h))$ using the identification

$$\tilde{h} = h e^{-u^{\tilde{h}, \mathcal{X}}}.$$

Additionally, one can associate to $\tilde{h}$ another potential $u^{\tilde{h}, \mathbb{C}^*} \in \text{PSH}(\mathbb{C}^* \times X, \text{pr}_2^* \Theta(h_1))$ using the identification

$$\rho_\tau^* \tilde{h}|_{X_1} = h_1 e^{-u_\tau^{\tilde{h}, \mathbb{C}^*}}, \quad \tau \in \mathbb{C}^*. \quad (13)$$

By analyzing the action of ρ restricted to global sections of $\mathcal{L}^r$, $r \geq 1$ on X_0 , we can associate to $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}, \pi, \rho)$ the Donaldson–Futaki invariant $DF(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$. For details we refer to [Sz2, Th]. We say that (X, L) is K-polystable if for any test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}, \pi, \rho)$ we have $DF(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \geq 0$ with $DF(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = 0$ if and only if $\mathcal{X}$ is a product.

Let us fix $\phi \in \text{PSH}(X, \Theta(h_1))$. According to Phong–Sturm [PS1, PS2] (see also [Be3, Section 2.4]), to $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}, \pi, \rho)$ one can also associate a bounded geodesic ray $[0, \infty) \ni t \rightarrow \phi_t \in \text{PSH}(X, \Theta(h_1)) \cap L^\infty$ (with $\phi_0 = \phi$) by first constructing a metric $\tilde{h} := h e^{-\phi^\mathcal{X}}$ on $\mathcal{L}$, using the following upper envelope:

$$\phi^\mathcal{X} = \sup\{v \in \text{PSH}(\mathcal{X}|_\Delta, \Theta(h)), v_\tau \leq \rho_{\tau^{-1}}^* \phi, |\tau| = 1\}.$$

The envelope $\phi^\mathcal{X}$ is seen to be S^1 -invariant, and one can introduce $\phi_t = \phi_{e^{-t/2}}^{\tilde{h}, \mathbb{C}^*} \in \text{PSH}(X, \omega) \cap L^\infty(X)$ for any $t \in [0, \infty)$. As argued in [PS1, PS2], this last curve $t \rightarrow \phi_t$ is indeed a weak $C^{1,1}$ -geodesic ray. In general, $t \rightarrow \phi_t$ is not normalized, i.e., $\text{AM}(\phi_t)$ is not identically zero (as this depends on the $\mathbb{C}^*$ -action). As follows from the proof of [Be3, Proposition 2.7] (see specifically the argument that gives (2.16), (2.17)), there exists $C := C(\phi, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{X}, h) > 0$ such that

$$h e^{-C} \leq h e^{-\phi^\mathcal{X}} \leq h e^C. \quad (14)$$

Proof of Theorem 1.6. Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}, \pi, \rho)$ be a test configuration equivariantly embedded into $\mathbb{CP}^N \times \mathbb{C}$ with a $\mathbb{C}^*$ -action $\mathbb{C}^* \ni \tau \rightarrow \rho_\tau \in GL(N+1, \mathbb{C})$. By possibly composing ρ_τ with an inner automorphism, we can and assume that the S^1 -invariant background metric is just the restriction of the relative Fubini-Study metric h^{FS} on $\mathcal{O}(1) \rightarrow (\mathbb{CP}^N, \mathbb{C})$. For the background Kähler metric on X we choose $\omega := \Theta(h_1^{FS})$.

We will prove that $DF(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \geq 0$ with $DF(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = 0$ if and only if $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}, \pi, \rho)$ is a product test configuration.

We will be relying on the following formula relating the Donaldson–Futaki invariant to the asymptotics of the K-energy [PT, PRS, Ti5, BJJ2, SD]:

$$\mathcal{K}(u_\tau^{h^{FS}, \mathbb{C}^*}) = -(DF(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) - a(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})) \log |\tau|^2 + O(1), \quad \tau \in \mathbb{C}^*, \quad (15)$$

where $a(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \geq 0$, and $a(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = 0$ precisely when the central fiber X_0 is reduced (recall the notation introduced in (13) above). From Theorem 1.5 it follows that $\mathcal{K}$ is bounded from below, hence $DF(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) - a(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \geq 0$, giving that $DF(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \geq 0$.

Now assume that $DF(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = 0$. To finish the proof we will argue that $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}, \pi, \rho)$ is a product test configuration. Let $\phi \in \mathcal{H}_\omega \cap \text{AM}^{-1}(0)$ be a cscK potential (recall that $\Theta(h_1) = \omega$ by choice) and let $[0, \infty) \ni t \rightarrow \phi_t \in \mathcal{E}^1$ be the associated $C^{1,1}$ -geodesic ray with $\phi_0 = \phi$.

First notice that (2) and Theorem 1.5 gives $\inf_{g \in G} J_\omega(g \cdot (u_{e^{-t/2}}^{h^{FS}, \mathbb{C}^*} - \text{AM}(u_{e^{-t/2}}^{h^{FS}, \mathbb{C}^*}))) < C'$. Pulling back the estimates of (14) by ρ_τ and taking the log, we immediately obtain $u_{e^{-t/2}}^{h^{FS}, \mathbb{C}^*} - C \leq \phi_t \leq u_{e^{-t/2}}^{h^{FS}, \mathbb{C}^*} + C$. Using monotonicity of AM, this further implies that $\phi_t - \text{AM}(\phi_t) - 2C \leq u_{e^{-t/2}}^{h^{FS}, \mathbb{C}^*} - \text{AM}(u_{e^{-t/2}}^{h^{FS}, \mathbb{C}^*}) \leq \phi_t - \text{AM}(\phi_t) + 2C$.

Putting the above facts together and using also the monotonicity of AM_ω , after possibly increasing C' , we arrive at:

$$\inf_{g \in G} J_\omega(g \cdot (\phi_t - \text{AM}(\phi_t))) < C'.$$

Given that ϕ_0 is a cscK potential, Lemma 3.1 below implies that the normalized ray $t \rightarrow \phi_t - \text{AM}(\phi_t)$ is induced by $t \rightarrow \exp_I(tJV)$, where V is a real holomorphic Hamiltonian Killing field of (X, J, ω) . By Lemma 3.2, it is even possible to find a lift $\tilde{V}$ to $L \rightarrow X$ such that

$$\exp_I(tJ\tilde{V})^* h_1^{FS} e^{-\phi_0} = h_1^{FS} e^{-\phi_t}.$$

Since $DF(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = 0$, (15) gives that $a(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = 0$, hence X_0 is reduced. Consequently, we can apply Proposition 3.3 to conclude that $\mathcal{X}$ is isomorphic to $X \times \mathbb{C}$, finishing the proof. $\square$

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose (X, ω) is a Kähler manifold. Let $u_0 \in \mathcal{H}_\omega \cap \text{AM}^{-1}(0)$ be a cscK potential and a finite energy geodesic ray $[0, \infty) \ni t \rightarrow u_t \in \mathcal{E}^1 \cap \text{AM}^{-1}(0)$ emanating from u_0 . If there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\inf_{g \in G} J_\omega(g \cdot u_t) < C, \quad t \in [0, \infty),$$

then there exists a real holomorphic Hamiltonian vector field $V \in \text{isom}(X, \omega_{u_0})$ such that $u_t = \exp_I(tJV) \cdot u_0$, where $t \rightarrow \exp_I(tJV)$ is the flow of JV .

Proof. Let $g_k \in G$ such that $J_\omega(g_k \cdot u_k) < C$. As u_0 is a cscK potential there exists $h_k \in \text{Isom}_0(X, \omega_{u_0})$ and a Hamiltonian vector field $V_k \in \text{isom}(X, \omega_{u_0})$ such that $g_k = h_k \exp_I(-JV_k)$ (see [DR, Propositions 6.2 and 6.9]). As the growth of the J functional is the same as that of the d_1 metric [DR, Proposition 5.5], and G acts by d_1 -isometries on $\mathcal{E}^1 \cap \text{AM}^{-1}(0)$ [DR, Lemma 5.9], by possibly increasing the constant C we can write:

$$C > d_1(u_0, g_k \cdot u_k) = d_1(g_k^{-1} u_0, u_k) = d_1(\exp(JV_k) \cdot u_0, u_k). \quad (16)$$

We can assume without loss of generality that $t \rightarrow u_t$ has unit d_1 -speed, i.e., $d_1(u_0, u_t) = t$. Using the above inequality, the triangle inequality gives the following double estimate:

$$k - C \leq d_1(u_0, \exp_I(JV_k) \cdot u_0) \leq k + C.$$

The analytic expression of $\exp_I(JV_k).u_0$ (see [DR, Lemma 5.8]) implies that in fact $1/D \leq \|JV_k/k\| \leq D$ for some $D > 1$. As the space of holomorphic Hamiltonian Killing fields of (X, ω_{u_0}, J) is finite dimensional, it follows that there exists a nonzero Killing field V such that $V_{k_j}/k_j \rightarrow V$ for some $k_j \rightarrow \infty$.

Let us introduce the smooth d_1 -geodesic segments

$$[0, k] \ni t \rightarrow u_t^k = \exp_I\left(t \frac{JV_k}{k}\right).u_0 \in \mathcal{H}_\omega \cap \text{AM}^{-1}(0).$$

By [BDL, Proposition 5.1] the function $t \rightarrow d_1(u_t^k, u_t)$ is convex, hence (16) gives that $d_1(u_t^k, u_t) \leq Ct/k$, $t \in [0, k]$. This implies that for fixed t we have $d_1(u_t^k, u_t) \rightarrow 0$. But examining convergence in the expressions defining $u_t^{k_j} = \exp_I(tJV_{k_j}/k_j).u_0$ we conclude that $u_t^{k_j} \rightarrow \exp_I(tJV).u_0$ smoothly, ultimately giving $u_t = \exp_I(tJV).u_0$. $\square$

In case the Kähler class is integral, we have the following addendum to the previous lemma:

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose $(L, h) \rightarrow X$ is a hermitian line bundle with $\omega := \Theta(h) > 0$. Let $\phi_0 \in \mathcal{H}_\omega$, a real holomorphic Hamiltonian vector field $V \in \text{isom}(X, J, \omega_{u_0})$, and $[0, \infty) \ni t \rightarrow \phi_t \in \mathcal{E}^1$ a geodesic ray. If the “normalization” of $t \rightarrow \phi_t$ is induced by V , i.e., $\phi_t - \text{AM}(\phi_t) = \exp_I(tJV).(\phi_0 - \text{AM}(\phi_0))$, then it is possible to find a lift $\tilde{V}$ of V to the line bundle $L \rightarrow X$ such that $\exp_I(t\tilde{J}\tilde{V})^*he^{-\phi_0} = he^{-\phi_t}$.*

This is essentially well-known, but as we could not find an adequate reference we include a proof here.

Proof. It is shown in [Do, Lemma 12] that it is possible to lift V to a vector field $\tilde{V}$ on $L \rightarrow X$. Below we recall the construction of $\tilde{V}$ and show that one of the lifts satisfies the required properties.

By computing the curvature of both sides and using the dd^c lemma, we see that for any lift there exists a smooth function $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\exp_I(t\tilde{J}\tilde{V})^*he^{-\phi_0} = he^{-\phi_t + f(t)}. \quad (17)$$

We will show that for the right choice of $\tilde{V}$ we have $f(t) \equiv 0$. In fact, as it will be clarified below, it all depends on how we choose the Hamiltonian potential of V .

Suppose $v \in C^\infty(X)$ such that $i_V\omega_{\phi_0} = dv$. After perhaps adjusting v by a constant, one can compute that (see [Ma1], [Sz2, Example 4.26])

$$\phi_t(x) - \phi_0(x) = 2 \int_0^t v(\exp_I(lJV)x) dl.$$

Let us fix $x_0 \in \text{Crit}(v)$, i.e., $dv(x_0) = 0$. This gives $V(x_0) = 0$, hence by the above

$$\phi_t(x_0) = \phi_0(x_0) + 2tv(x_0). \quad (18)$$

We now recall the main elements of [Be1, Lemma 13] and its proof. For this, it will be more convenient to use the complex notation for holomorphic vector fields. To avoid confusion, recall that $V^c = V - iJV$ and $V = \text{Re } V := (V^c + \overline{V^c})/2$.

Let $(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ be coordinates on X in a neighborhood U of x_0 . Let s be a non-vanishing section of L on U and we introduce $e^{-\phi(z)} := he^{-\phi_0}(s, \bar{s})(z)$. Let W^c be the

generator of the natural $\mathbb{C}^*$ -action along the fibres of L . In local holomorphic coordinates $(z_1, \dots, z_n, w)$ of $L \rightarrow X$ on U we have $W^\mathbb{C} = w \frac{\partial}{\partial w}$ and $V^\mathbb{C} = V^j \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j} = -2i\phi^{j\bar{k}} v_{\bar{k}} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j}$ (note the missing factor in the corresponding formula in the proof of [Be1, Lemma 13]), where we have used that V is Hamiltonian (in holomorphic coordinates $iV^j \phi_{j\bar{k}} = 2v_{\bar{k}}$).

If $V_{hor}^\mathbb{C}$ is the horizontal lift of $V^\mathbb{C}$ with respect to the connection of the metric $he^{-\phi_0}$ on L , then one can compute that $V_{hor}^\mathbb{C} = V^\mathbb{C} + \partial\phi(V^\mathbb{C})W^\mathbb{C}$. An elementary calculation gives that

$$\tilde{V}^\mathbb{C} = V_{hor}^\mathbb{C} + 2ivW^\mathbb{C} = V^\mathbb{C} + W^\mathbb{C}(\partial\phi(V^\mathbb{C}) + 2iv)$$

is a holomorphic lift of V to $L \rightarrow X$. By this last formula, at the critical point x_0 we actually have $J\tilde{V}^\mathbb{C}(x_0) = -2v(x_0)w \frac{\partial}{\partial w}$. This immediately gives that the flow of $J\tilde{V} = \text{Re } J\tilde{V}^\mathbb{C}$ satisfies $\exp_I(tJ\tilde{V})(x_0, w) = (x_0, e^{-v(x_0)t}w)$, ultimately implying

$$\exp_I(tJ\tilde{V})^* h e^{-\phi_0(x_0)}(x_0) = h e^{-\phi_0(x_0) - 2tv(x_0)}(x_0). \quad (19)$$

A comparison of (17), (18) and (19) gives that $f(t) \equiv 0$, finishing the proof. $\square$

The proof of Theorem 1.6 is completed by invoking the following result from [Be3]:

Proposition 3.3. *Let X be a Kähler manifold with positive line bundle $L \rightarrow X$ and a normal test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}, \pi, \rho)$ with S^1 -invariant smooth background metric h , and reduced central fiber X_0 . Given $\phi_0 \in \mathcal{H}_{\Theta(h_1)}$, suppose that the associated geodesic ray $t \rightarrow \phi_t$ is induced by a vector field $\tilde{V}$ of $L \rightarrow X$, i.e., $\exp_I(tJ\tilde{V})^* h_1 e^{-\phi_0} = h_1 e^{-\phi_t}$. Then $\mathcal{X}$ is isomorphic to $X \times \mathbb{C}$.*

Although formulated in the slightly different context of Fano varieties in [Be3], the proof of this proposition follows word for word from the proof of [Be3, Proposition 3.3], thanks to the lifting property established in the previous lemma (which generalizes [Be3, formula (3.9)]). Here we only point out the idea of the proof and direct the reader to [Be3] to check the precise details.

We introduce the maps $f_t = \exp_I(-\log t^2 J\tilde{V}) \in \text{Aut}_0(X, L)$, $G_t = \rho_t \circ f_{t-1} : X_1 \rightarrow X_t$, $t \in (0, \infty)$. Additionally, we can suppose that the test configuration $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}, \pi, \rho)$ is equivariantly embedded into $\mathbb{CP}^N \times \mathbb{C}$ and the actions $\mathbb{R}^+ \ni t \rightarrow \rho_t, f_t \in GL(N+1, \mathbb{C})$ satisfy $f_t(X_1) = X_t$, $\rho_t(X_1) = X_t$ and $\mathcal{O}(1)|_{X_t} = L_t$.

Without loss of generality, after perhaps applying an inner-automorphism on the action $\tau \rightarrow \rho_\tau$, we can also suppose that the smooth S^1 -invariant background metric h is just the pullback of the relative Fubini-Study metric h^{FS} on $\mathcal{O}(1) \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}^N \times \mathbb{C}$. The point of the proof is to argue why the family of maps $G_t : X_1 \rightarrow X_t \subset \mathbb{CP}^N$ is compact, hence it is possible to take a (subsequential) limit $G_0 := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} G_t : X_1 \rightarrow X_0$. Then it is argued in detail (see [Be3]) that this map is in fact bijection, finishing the proof. Notice that a direct application of (14) gives that

$$\rho_t^* h^{FS} e^{-C} \leq \rho_t^* h^{FS} e^{-\phi^\chi} \leq \rho_t^* h^{FS} e^C.$$

By the convention in (13) we have $\rho_t^* h^{FS} e^{-\phi^\chi}|_{X_1} = h_1^{FS} e^{-\phi - \log t^2}$. By the assumption on the ray $t \rightarrow \phi_t$ we additionally have $h_1^{FS} e^{-\phi - \log t^2} = f_t^* h_1^{FS} e^{-\phi_0}$, hence we can proceed to write

$$G_t^* h^{FS} e^{-C} = f_{t-1}^* \rho_t^* h^{FS} e^{-C} \leq h_1^{FS} e^{-\phi} \leq f_{t-1}^* \rho_t^* h^{FS} e^C = G_t^* h^{FS} e^C. \quad (20)$$

Basic properties of the Fubini-Study metric h^{FS} yield now that $\{G_t : X_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}^N\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+}$ is indeed a normal family.

References

- [ACGT] V. Apostolov, D.M.J. Calderbank, P. Gauduchon, C.W. Tønnesen-Friedman, Hamiltonian 2-forms in Kähler geometry III, extremal metrics and stability. *Invent. Math.* 173, 547–601 (2008).
- [Be1] R. Berman, Analytic torsion, vortices and positive Ricci curvature, arXiv:1006.2988.
- [Be2] R. Berman, A thermodynamical formalism for Monge–Ampère equations, Moser–Trudinger inequalities and Kähler–Einstein metrics. *Adv. Math.* 248 (2013), 1254–1297.
- [Be3] R. Berman, K-polystability of Q-Fano varieties admitting Kähler-Einstein metrics, *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 1-53. Doi:10.1007/s00222-015-0607-7.
- [BB] R. Berman, B. Berndtsson, Convexity of the K-energy on the space of Kähler metrics, arXiv:1405.0401.
- [BBJ] R. Berman, S. Boucksom, M. Jonsson, A variational approach to the Yau-Tian-Donaldson conjecture. arXiv:1509.04561.
- [BBEGZ] R. Berman, S. Boucksom, P. Eyssidieux, V. Guedj, A. Zeriahi, Kähler-Einstein metrics and the Kähler-Ricci flow on log Fano varieties, arXiv:1111.7158.
- [BDL] R. Berman, T. Darvas, C.H. Lu, Convexity of the extended K-energy and large time behavior of the weak Calabi flow, arXiv:1510.01260.
- [BHJ1] Uniform K-stability, Duistermaat-Heckman measures and singularities of pairs. arXiv:1504.06568
- [BHJ2] S. Boucksom, T. Hisamoto, M. Jonsson: Uniform K-stability and asymptotics of energy functionals in Kähler geometry. arXiv:1603.01026.
- [Ch1] X.X. Chen, On the lower bound of the Mabuchi energy and its application, *Int. Math. Res. Not.* (2000), no. 12, 607–623.
- [Ch2] X.X. Chen, Space of Kähler metrics (IV) - On the lower bound of the K-energy, arXiv:0809.4081.
- [CPZ] X.X. Chen, M. Păun, Y. Zeng, On deformation of extremal metrics, arXiv:1506.01290.
- [CS] G. Codogni, J. Stoppa, Torus equivariant K-stability, arXiv:1602.03451.
- [Da1] T. Darvas, The Mabuchi completion of the space of Kähler potentials, arXiv:1401.7318.
- [Da2] T. Darvas, The Mabuchi Geometry of Finite Energy Classes, *Adv. Math.* 285 (2015).
- [DR] T. Darvas, Y.A. Rubinstein, Tian’s properness conjecture and Finsler geometry of the space of Kähler metrics, arXiv:1506.07129.
- [Dem] J.P. Demailly, Complex Analytic and Differential Geometry. Book available at <https://www-fourier.ujf-grenoble.fr/~demailly/manuscripts/agbook.pdf>.
- [Der] R. Dervan. Uniform stability of twisted constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics . To appear in *Int. Math. Res. Notices*. arXiv:1412.0648
- [DeR] R. Dervan, J. Ross, K-stability for Kähler Manifolds, arXiv:1602.08983.
- [DL] E. Di Nezza, C.H. Lu, Uniqueness and short time regularity of the weak Kähler-Ricci flow, arXiv:1411.7958.
- [Do] S.K. Donaldson, Scalar curvature and stability of toric varieties, *J. Diff. Geom.* 62 (2002), 289-349.
- [G] V. Guedj, The metric completion of the Riemannian space of Kähler metrics, arXiv:1401.7857.
- [GZ1] V. Guedj, A. Zeriahi, The weighted Monge-Ampère energy of quasisubharmonic functions, *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 250 (2007), 442-482.
- [GZ2] V. Guedj, A. Zeriahi, Regularizing properties of the twisted Kähler-Ricci flow, *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, Ahead of Print. DOI 10.1515/crelle-2014-0105.

- [LX] C. Li, C. Xu, Special test configurations and K-stability of Fano varieties, *Annals. of Math.* Volume 180 (2014), 197–232.
- [Ma1] T. Mabuchi, Some symplectic geometry on compact Kähler manifolds, I. *Osaka J. Math.* 24, (1987), 227–252.
- [Ma2] T. Mabuchi, K-stability of constant scalar curvature polarization, [arXiv:0812.4093](#).
- [Ma3] T. Mabuchi, A stronger concept of K-stability, [arXiv:0910.4617](#).
- [Sto] J. Stoppa, K-stability of constant scalar curvature Kaehler manifolds, *Advances in Mathematics* 221 no. 4 (2009), 1397–1408.
- [StSz] J. Stoppa and G. Székelyhidi, Relative K-stability of extremal metrics, *Journal of the European Mathematical Society* 13 no. 4 (2011), 899–909.
- [PRS] D.H. Phong, J. Ross, J. Sturm, Deligne pairings and the Knudsen-Mumford expansion. *J. Differential Geom.* 78 (2008), no. 3, 475–496.
- [PSSW] D.H. Phong, J. Song, J. Sturm, B. Weinkove, The Moser–Trudinger inequality on Kähler–Einstein manifolds, *Amer. J. Math.* 130 (2008), 651–665.
- [PS1] D.H. Phong, J. Sturm, Test configurations for K-stability and geodesic rays, *J. Symp. Geom.* 5 (2007) 221–247.
- [PS2] D.H. Phong, J. Sturm, The Dirichlet problem for degenerate complex Monge–Ampère equations. *Comm. Anal. Geom.* 18 (2010), no. 1, 145–170.
- [PT] S. T. Paul and G. Tian, CM Stability and the Generalized Futaki Invariant II. *Astérisque* No. 328 (2009), 339–354.
- [SD] Z. Sjöström Dyrefelt, K-semistability of cscK manifolds with transcendental cohomology class, [arXiv:1601.07659](#).
- [Sz1] G. Székelyhidi, Filtrations and test-configurations. [arXiv:1111.4986](#). *Math. Ann.* 362(2015), 451–484
- [Sz2] G. Székelyhidi, An introduction to extremal Kähler metrics. *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*, 152. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2014. xvi+192 pp. ISBN: 978-1-4704-1047-6.
- [Ti1] G. Tian, The K–energy on hypersurfaces and stability, *Comm. Anal. Geom.* 2 (1994), 239–265.
- [Ti2] G. Tian, Kähler–Einstein metrics with positive scalar curvature, *Invent. Math.* 130 (1997), 1–37.
- [Ti3] G. Tian, *Canonical Metrics in Kähler Geometry*, Birkhäuser, 2000.
- [Ti4] G. Tian, Existence of Einstein metrics on Fano manifolds, in: *Metric and Differential Geometry (X.-Z. Dai et al., Eds.)*, Springer, 2012, pp. 119–159.
- [Ti5] G. Tian, K-stability implies CM-stability, [arXiv:1409.7836](#).
- [TZ] G. Tian, X. Zhu, A nonlinear inequality of Moser-Trudinger type, *Calc. Var. PDE* 10 (2000), 349–354.
- [Th] R.P. Thomas, Notes on GIT and symplectic reduction for bundles and varieties, *Surveys in differential geometry. Vol. X*, 221–273, *Surv. Differ. Geom.*, 10, Int. Press, MA, 2006.

CHALMERS UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY
 robertb@chalmers.se

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
 tdarvas@math.umd.edu

SCUOLA NORMALE SUPERIORE, PISA, ITALY
 chnh.lu@sns.it